28
BURKE, WILLIAMS &

27

///

///

- 1. WHEREAS on or about November 8, 2014, an action was commenced in the Superior Court of the State of California in and for the County of Alameda, entitled, FEDERATED UNIVERSITY POLICE OFFICERS' ASSOCIATION, on behalf of itself and its members, ANDREW LOPEZ, on behalf of himself and all similarly situated individuals v. THE REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, et al, bearing case number RG14747309 in the records and files of that court.
- 2. WHEREAS on November 18, 2014, a copy of the Summons and Complaint in this Action was served on Defendant The Regents. On November 19, 2014 a copy of the Summons and Complaint in this Action was served on Defendants Henisey and Hutchinson.
- 3. WHEREAS on November 18, 2014, a copy of the Summons and Complaint in this Action was served on Defendant Johnson Controls, Inc.
- 4. WHEREAS this Action, styled as a class action, is a civil action of which this Court has original jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. section 1441(a) in that it arises under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and the 4th Amendment to the United States Constitution and 18 U.S.C. § 2520. "[F]ederal-question jurisdiction is invoked by and large by plaintiffs pleading a cause of action created by federal law (e.g., claims under 42 U.S.C. § 1983)." *Grable & Sons Metal Products, Inc. v. Darue Engineering & Mfg.*, 545 U.S. 308 (2005).
- 5. WHEREAS the Action arises from Plaintiffs' allegations that they were subject to non-consensual video and audio recording of confidential communications within and without the University of California Irvine Police Department Building located in Irvine California. Plaintiffs allege that they were deprived of their Fourth Amendment right to be free from unreasonable search and seizure and informational privacy by Defendants in violation of 42 U.S.C. § 1983,

and that Defendants violated their right to be free from audio recording without their consent in violation of the Federal Wire and Electronic Communications Interception and Interception of Oral Communications Law, 18 U.S.C. § 2520 *et seq.* Complaint at ¶¶ 52, 72-75.

- 6. In addition to the federal claims, the Complaint asserts causes of action for violation of privacy rights under the California Constitution, Article I and California Penal Code §637.2. Plaintiffs all seek injunctive relief pursuant to Section 1085 of the California Code of Civil Procedure. Plaintiffs' state law claims are based on the same "common nucleus of operative facts", namely the alleged non-consensual video and audio recording at the University of California Irvine Police Department Building located in Irvine California.
- 7. WHEREAS all of the operative facts relating to the action occurred in the Central District, specifically, in Irvine, California at the Irvine Campus of the University of California.
- 8. WHEREAS all of the key witnesses and parties reside in the Central District;
- 9. WHEREAS all relevant documents and evidence related to this action are located and maintained in the Central District in Irvine California at the University of California, Irvine campus;

- 3 -

///

18

19

27

28

1	IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED BY AND BETWEEN THE PARTIES That		
2	the above-referenced action be transferred from the Northern District of California		
3	to the Central District of California, Southern Division for the convenience of		
4	parties and witnesses and in the interests of justice pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a).		
5	-	parado una manesses ana m une meeresis of justice parsuant to 20 em en § 110 n(a).	
6	Dated: January 26, 2015 BURF	KE, WILLIAMS & SORENSEN, LLP	
7	·	s/ Daphne M. Anneet	
8		Daphne M. Anneet neys for Defendants/Respondents	
9	9 THE I	REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF	
10	0 HENI	FORNIA, POLICE CHIEF PAUL SEY and ASSISTANT POLICE CHIEF	
11		REY HUTCHISON	
12	Dated: January 26, 2015 MAS	ΓAGNI HOLSTEDT	
13		/a / Varin A Elautt	
14	4	Kevin A. Flautt Kevin A. Flautt	
15	P FEDE	neys for Plaintiffs/Petitioners RATED UNIVERSITY POLICE	
16	6 and its	CERS' ASSOCIATION, on behalf of itself s members, ANDREW LOPEZ, on behalf uself and all similarly situated individuals	
17	7	iseif and all similarly situated individuals	
18	Dated: January 26, 2015 ORRI	CK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP	
19		/a/ Jaganh C. Lihuut	
20	0	/s/ Joseph C. Liburt Joseph C. Liburt	
21	1 JOHN	neys for Defendant/Respondent (SON CONTROLS, INC.	
22	SIGNATURE ATTESTATION		
23	I hereby attest that I have obtained the authorization from the signatories to		
24	this e-filed document and have been authorized to indicate their consent by a		
25	conformed signature (s /) within this e-filed document.		
26			
27	7	s/ Daphne M. Anneet_	
28			
IAMS & LLP	& LA #4835-1750-8641 v1	- 4 - STIPULATION TO TRANSFER VENUE	

BURKE, WILLIAMS & SORENSEN, LLP ATTORNEYS AT LAW LOS ANGELES

DISTRIC

LOS ANGELES